



Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP

457 Haddonfield Road

Suite 100

Cherry Hill, NJ 08002-2223

Telephone (856) 321-2400

Fax (856) 321-2415

www.stradley.com

Francis X. Manning

fmanning@stradley.com

856-321-2403

March 25, 2013

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

The Honorable Faith S. Hochberg
United States District Judge
United States District Court for
the District of New Jersey
Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse
50 Walnut Street , PO 01
Newark, NJ 07101

RE: Patient Care Associates LLC a/s/o G.V. and P.V. v. Cytec Industries, et al
U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey
Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-01616-FSH-PS

Dear Judge Hochberg:

In accordance with Your Honor's Standing Order Requiring Submission of Information Regarding Removal, defendant Cytec Industries, Inc. ("Cytec") responds as follows:

1. A full explanation if all Defendants served at the time of removal did not join in the notice of removal.

Response: Not applicable because the other defendants are fictitious "Doe" entities.

The Honorable Faith Hochberg
March 25, 2013
Page 2

2. A full explanation if the notice of removal was dated more than thirty (30) days after the first Defendant was served.

Response: Not applicable because Cytec removed the action within 30 days of being served with Plaintiff's Complaint, Summons and Track Assignment Notice.

3. If the action has been removed on grounds of diversity jurisdiction, a statement if any of the Defendants served at the time of removal is a citizen of the forum state.

Response: Not applicable because Cytec removed this action on the basis of federal question jurisdiction under the Employee Retirement Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. §1001 et seq.

4. If the action has been removed on grounds of diversity jurisdiction, the citizenship of Plaintiff and all named Defendants.

Response: Not applicable. See response to No. 3 above.

5. If the action has been removed on grounds of diversity jurisdiction, both parties must submit a good faith estimate of the amount in controversy with supporting documentation.

Response: Not applicable. See response to No. 3 above.

6. If the action has been removed on the basis of federal question jurisdiction, the federal statutory provision that gives rise to the jurisdiction and the specific section that provides Plaintiff with a private right of action.

Response: Count I is for violation of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B). The Court has jurisdiction over this claim pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §1132(e)(1).

The Honorable Faith Hochberg
March 25, 2013
Page 3

Count II is for violation of fiduciary duties under ERISA. Title 29 U.S.C. §1132(a)(3) provides a private right of action to a participant or beneficiary of an ERISA plan for violation of fiduciary duties thereunder. Title 29 U.S.C. §1132(e)(1) vests exclusive jurisdiction for such claims in the district courts of the United States.

/s/Francis X. Manning
Francis X. Manning
STRADLEY RONON STEVENS & YOUNG, LLP
A Pennsylvania Limited Liability Partnership
LibertyView Suite 100
457 Haddonfield Road
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
(856) 321-2400
Attorneys for Defendant, Cytex Industries

FXM/bac

cc: via Court's electronic filing server to:
Andrew R. Bronsnick, Esquire